



## **Route 238 Working Group Meeting**

May 26, 2004  
Summary Notes

### **Committee Members**

Bob Billmire  
Bob Brauer  
Seth Kaplan  
Audrey LePell  
Ed Mullins (Alt.)  
Sherman Lewis

### **City Representatives**

Jesús Armas – City Manager  
Dennis Butler – Director of Public Works  
Robert Bauman – Deputy Director of Public Works

### **Others**

Bill Quirk  
Evelyn Cormier  
Ken Price  
Bob Preston  
Christine Monsen  
Art Dao  
Jimmy Sims

### **Items Discussed:**

#### **Public Comments**

Ms. Diane Ferchel read a statement noting the proposed project does not take into account non-motorized traffic such as pedestrians and bicyclists.

Councilmember Bill Quirk wanted to thank the working group members and staff for their efforts and wanted to make sure that other alternatives would be examined.

#### **Approval of Summary Notes –April 28, 2004 Meeting**

Ms. LePell wanted to clarify that she did support the Mayor's idea of all-pedestrian phase at traffic signals. She also asked that her written comments be included as part of the minutes. She wanted to change the word "will" in "...the School District will oppose the closure of E Street" to "may."

Mr. Kaplan wanted to clarify that he wasn't involved with preparation of the City's Bicycle Master Plan, but had spoken to the East Bay Bicycle Coalition about it. He also wanted to clarify that there wasn't adequate data to make a decision about bike lanes.

#### **Making Sense of the Data**

Mr. Armas opened the discussion and asked the working group members to provide input to what has been presented to them thus far. Ms. LePell said there hasn't been much discussion on pedestrian and bike issues. She wanted to know if staff has any data on pedestrian bridges or other means of pedestrian crossings at other locations. Mr. Butler noted the City does not have any data but suggested we could make inquiries of other agencies that have similar situations. Mr. Sims noted his firm has been involved with design and construction of number of pedestrian bridges and noted issues relating to those, such as maintenance and accessibility issues. Ms. LePell also wanted to get input from bicycle and disability groups. Mr. Brauer

asked if we could look at a few other pedestrian solutions at similar crossings and see which one works best for our project. He mentioned the all-pedestrian phase as an example. Mr. Armas noted that all-pedestrian phase is normally seen at more densely populated locations, such as in San Francisco. Mr. Mullins noted that issues regarding pedestrians, bicyclists, and persons with disability are very critical. Ms. LePell said that she's familiar with Shattuck Avenue in Berkeley that has in-pavement crosswalk lights, but was not sure if they enhance safety. Mr. Armas noted in-pavement lights are located on Amador Street near the County Courthouse. Mr. Armas indicated that staff will inquire from other agencies on how they have addressed their crossing issues at similarly wide intersections with high vehicular traffic. Mr. Lewis noted that he wasn't convinced about the reliability of the traffic model results for the year 2025. He also asked the meaning of Exhibit C "Sum of NB & SB peak-Hour Travel Times." Mr. Bauman explained it is the total time it takes to travel on the corridor from Foothill Blvd at Mattox to Mission Blvd at Industrial parkway, and return during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. It's only meant for comparison purposes of no-project, reduced-lane project, and project. Mr. Lewis then noted the small differences between Vehicle Hours Traveled and Vehicle Miles Traveled for the project and reduced-lane scenario. Mr. Butler noted the significant difference is depicted for Miles of Congestion citywide, from 155.3 miles for project and 165.3 miles for reduced-lane scenario. Mr. Armas said that we have previously noted the impact not on parallel routes under the no project scenario and the reduction of traffic on local streets with the project. Mr. Kaplan noted that larger numbers don't clearly show the difference, but neighborhood impacts are significant.

#### **Public Meeting June 16, 2004**

Mr. Armas described the process for the Public Meeting on June 16, and noted its similarity to the public meeting for the Consensus Group project. He said that approximately 3,500 fliers are being mailed to businesses and property owners along the corridor. He also noted that displays will be available for the public to review prior to the meeting. Mr. Billmire asked the displays be available sooner and for longer time, so the public could view them, which staff said could be done. Mr. Armas said the meeting will be broadcast on public TV and web cast on the City's web site and archived for future viewing. Mr. Armas pointed out the working group members' role as observers and asked that they refrain from expressing remarks, since the goal of the meeting is to get public input.

#### **Comments by Working Group Members**

Ms. LePell asked where we stand regarding the flyover and traffic through County area. Mr. Armas noted what Mr. Kaplan reported on the County residents' preference and that majority of the working group members agreed the Strobridge ramp modification would be the best option.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 PM.